



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/671,304

09/24/2003

Bronislava Gedulin

18528.643 / 0101-UTL-0

8486

7590

11/17/2009

David Marsh
555 12th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-1206

EXAMINER

WINSTON, RANDALL O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1655

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/17/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/671,304	GEDULIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Randall Winston	1655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,9,14-22 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,9,14-20,27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt and entry of the amendment filed on 06/30/2009.

Claims 1, 6, 9, 14-20 and 27-30 have been examined on the merits (Claims 21 and 22 remain withdrawn from consideration).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 6, 9, 14-20 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (US 5,677,279) in further view of Iovanna et al. (US 5,436,169), Valter (Derwent Acc 1979-G6671B and/or SU 628925A, see abstract), Jorgensen et al. (US 4,370,317) and Haddad et al. (*The use of a low fat diet in the treatment of acute pancreatitis*, American Journal of Gastroenterology, (September 2000), Vol. 95, No. 9, pp. 2479) for the reasons set forth in the previous OFFICE ACTION which are restated below.

Applicant claims a method of treating acute pancreatitis and/or pancreatitis in a mammalian subject (i.e. human) comprising administering to said subject an effective amount of the amylin analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin, an analgesic and a pancreatic enzyme and/or a regimen (i.e. a low fat diet).

Young teaches a method of relieving the pain and/or treating painful inflammation disorders in a mammalian subject comprising administering to said subject an effective amount of the same amylin analog as the claimed invention amylin analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin in combination with an analgesic to treat painful inflammation disorders (see, e.g. see abstract, claims and claims 18-19 and column 4 lines 63-64). Young, however, does not teach that the mammalian subject's pain is caused by painful inflammation disorder such as acute pancreatitis nor Young teach the claimed pancreatic enzyme included within the composition and/or to include within the treatment of acute pancreatitis a low fat diet.

Iovanna et al. beneficially teaches that acute pancreatitis is a very painful inflammation condition and/or inflammation disorder (see, e.g. entire patent including abstract).

Valter beneficially teaches that acute pancreatitis is a very painful inflammation condition and/or inflammation disorder (see, e.g. abstract).

Jorgensen et al. beneficially teach that pancreatin treats pancreatitis (please note that pancreatin is defined as an extract from the pancreas of animals that contains pancreatic enzymes) (see, e.g. column 8 lines 36-41).

Haddad et al. beneficially teach to include within the treatment of acute pancreatitis a low fat diet (see, e.g. entire article).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have administered the same amylin analog as the claimed invention's amylin analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin and an analgesic to treat

Art Unit: 1655

the painful inflammation disorder of acute pancreatitis in a mammalian subject because Young teaches that the amylin analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin and an analgesic treats painful inflammation disorders and Iovanna and/or Valter teaches that acute pancreatitis is a painful inflammation disorder. Thus, when the same amylin analog as the claimed invention's analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin in combination with an analgesic are administered to a mammalian subject body for treating painful inflammation disorders, the same claimed amylin analog would intrinsically treat the painful inflammation disorder of acute pancreatitis an addition to the same claimed amylin analog would also intrinsically have the same claimed functional effect as the claimed invention's functional effect (i.e. to reduce or inhibit the level of inflammation, enzymatic activity or enzymatic secretion in pancreatic cells-also please note that when the claimed amylin analog is treating the painful inflammation disorder of acute pancreatitis, the claimed amylin analog would also intrinsically treat the broadly genus claimed pancreatitis disorder because acute pancreatitis is a form and/or species of pancreatitis) . Moreover, it would have been obvious to modify Young's administration's method of administering the same amylin analog as the claimed inventions amylin analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin in combination with an analgesic to include the teaching of Jorgensen which states a pancreatic enzyme such as pancreatin is well known in the art for treating pancreatitis and/or to include the teachings of Haddad which discloses to include within the treatment of acute pancreatitis a low fat diet because the above combined teachings as a whole would create the claimed method of treating the painful inflammation disorder of acute pancreatitis in a mammalian subject. The adjustments of

Art Unit: 1655

other conventional working conditions (i.e. the substitution of the administration of one mammalian subject for another and determining suitable amounts/ranges of each active ingredient within the claimed composition), is deemed a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, the claimed invention was prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Applicant's argument has been carefully considered but it is not deemed persuasive. Applicant argues that the Declaration of Dr. Chen submitted on 06/30/2009 states that another type of pancreatitis is chronic pancreatitis which is different from acute pancreatitis because some people with chronic pancreatitis have no pain, thus, pain does not always accompany, so no motivation is present to treat pancreatitis by administering amylin.

Although Applicant argues that the Declaration of Dr. Chen submitted on 06/30/2009 states that another type of pancreatitis is chronic pancreatitis which is different from acute pancreatitis because some people with chronic pancreatitis have no pain, thus, pain does not always accompany, so no motivation is present to treat pancreatitis by administering amylin, Applicant argument is not found persuasive because it appears to Examiner that since Applicant is not claiming within its claims chronic pancreatitis but instead pancreatitis and/or acute pancreatitis, when the claimed amylin analog is treating the painful inflammation disorder of acute pancreatitis, the

Art Unit: 1655

claimed amylin analog would also intrinsically treat the broadly genus claimed pancreatitis disorder because acute pancreatitis is a form and/or species of the broadly genus claimed pancreatitis disorder. Therefore, Examiner maintains that it would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have administered the same amylin analog as the claimed invention's amylin analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin and an analgesic to treat the painful inflammation disorder of acute pancreatitis and/or pancreatitis in a mammalian subject because Young teaches that the amylin analog of 25,28,29 Pro-h-amylin and an analgesic treats painful inflammation disorders and Iovanna and/or Valter teaches that acute pancreatitis is a painful inflammation disorder.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randall Winston whose telephone number is 571-272-0972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terry McKelvey can be reached on 571-272-0775. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RW

/Christopher R. Tate/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1655